1 Gary W. Osborne (Bar No. 145734) Dominic S. Nesbitt (Bar No. 146590) OSBORNE & NESBITT LLP 501 West Broadway, Suite 1760 3 San Diego, California 92101 Phone: (619) 557-0343 4 Fax: (619) 557-0107 gosborne@onlawllp.com dnesbitt@onlawllp.com 5 6 Attorneys for Plaintiff LA JOLLA COUNTRY DAY SCHOOL 8 9 10 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 11 FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 12 '11CV0868 LAB WMC LA JOLLA COUNTRY DAY CASE NO. 13 SCHOOL, a California Non-Profit Corporation, 14 **COMPLAINT FOR BREACH OF** Plaintiff, **CONTRACT: BREACH OF** 15 STATUTORY DUTY (Cal. Civ. Code § 2860); TORTIOUS BREAT THE IMPLIED COVENANT OF AND FAIR DEAL 2860); TORTIOUS BREACH OF 16 VS. PHILADELPHIA INDEMNITY GOOD FAITH AND FAIR DEALING; 17 AND FOR PUNITIVE DAMAGES INSURANCE COMPANY, a Pennsylvania corporation, 18 Defendants. 19 20 21 22 23 Plaintiff La Jolla Country Day School ("LJCD") respectfully alleges as follows: 24 **INTRODUCTION** 25 This case is about an insurance company's deliberate withholding of insurance 26 benefits owing to its insured. The benefits in question are independent counsel fees 27 which the plaintiff, LJCD, has incurred pursuant to California Civil Code section 2860, 28 i.e., the Cumis statute.

There is no dispute that the defendant, Philadelphia Indemnity Insurance Company ("Philadelphia"), owes LJCD's independent counsel fees. Philadelphia agreed to defend a lawsuit brought against LJCD by a former student, while reserving its right to deny coverage if LJCD was found to have acted intentionally. Philadelphia eventually acknowledged that this reservation triggered LJCD's statutory right to be represented by independent counsel, and expressly agreed in writing that it would pay LJCD's independent counsel fees.

Put quite simply, it is now almost one year later, and Philadelphia has still not paid a single penny of the fees and costs of LJCD's independent counsel.

An insurer does not satisfy its duty to defend by merely making empty promises. Instead, the duty to defend is only satisfied, in cases where a *Cumis* conflict exists, by the insurer actually paying the fees and costs of its insured's independent counsel. By deliberately failing to pay any of the fees and costs of LJCD's independent counsel, Philadelphia has breached its duty to defend.

LJCD seeks by this lawsuit to recover not only damages for Philadelphia's breaches of its duty to defend and statutory obligations, together with prejudgment interest, but also tort and punitive damages both to punish Philadelphia and to dissuade it in the future from deliberately violating California's statutory and insurance laws when doing business with residents of this state.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

- 1. This Court has jurisdiction over the subject matter of this complaint pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1332(a) because there is complete diversity of citizenship between the parties and the amount in controversy exceeds the sum of \$75,000, exclusive of interest and costs.
- 2. Venue is proper in this District under 28 U.S.C. §1391(a) and (c), as the contracts of insurance which are the subject of this action were entered into, and were to be performed, within this District, the underlying lawsuit giving rise to this claim was filed in this district, and defendant resides here.

THE PARTIES

- 3. Plaintiff LJCD is a non-profit corporation duly organized and existing under the laws of the State of California, with its principal place of business in San Diego, California.
- 4. Defendant Philadelphia is, and at all relevant times has been, a corporation organized and existing under the laws of the State of Pennsylvania, with its principal place of business also in Pennsylvania.

GENERAL ALLEGATIONS

A. Philadelphia Insured LJCD, Promising a Defense Against Professional <u>Liability Claims</u>

- 5. Philadelphia issued a CGL policy to LJCD, designated by policy number PHPK351983, with a policy period of October 1, 2008 to October 1, 2009, and with policy limits of \$1 million per occurrence and \$3 million in the aggregate. Philadelphia's CGL policy included a "Human Services Organization Professional Liability Coverage Part" with the same policy number, policy period, and policy limits.
- 6. Philadelphia promised under this Professional Liability Coverage Part to defend LJCD (including its board members, directors, officers, administrators, employees, etc.) against any lawsuit seeking damages arising out of a "professional incident" in the course of performing professional services.

B. <u>LJCD and Two of the School's Administrators Are Sued in an Underlying Lawsuit</u>

- 7. On April 3, 2009, during the term of Philadelphia's policy, a former student (designated as "Barbara B.") filed a lawsuit before the San Diego County Superior Court, entitled *Barbara B., et al. v. La Jolla Country Day School, et al.* Barbara B.'s complaint named LJCD and two of the school's administrators as defendants.
- 8. Barbara B. alleged that she had been bullied by other students and that LJCD's administration had responded inadequately to this problem, eventually resulting in her leaving LJCD. The lawsuit threatened to damage LJCD's reputation in the local

community. The plaintiff's father told a LJCD coach that he intended to drag LJCD "through the mud" for threatening to expel his daughter because of disciplinary problems.

9. Barbara B. alleged causes of action against all three LJCD defendants for "Intentional Infliction of Emotional Distress" and "Breach of Contract." Her complaint was later amended at trial to allege additional causes of action for "Negligence" and "Negligent Infliction of Emotional Distress."

C. <u>Philadelphia Breached its Duty to Defend as Well as its Statutory Duties</u> under California Civil Code Section 2860

- 10. Immediately upon being served with the *Barbara B*. complaint, LJCD tendered it to Philadelphia. On or about May 1, 2009, Philadelphia agreed to defend the LJCD defendants. Subsequently, on June 15, 2009, Philadelphia issued a reservation-of-rights letter informing the LJCD defendants that it was reserving its right to deny coverage if they were found liable for intentional conduct.
- 11. Philadelphia's reservation-of-rights letter created a paradigm *Cumis* conflict of interest which triggered the LJCD defendants' statutory right to be represented by independent counsel pursuant to Civil Code section 2860. Philadelphia owed a statutory duty under section 2860(a) to inform its insureds that a conflict of interest existed and to obtain a written waiver of the insureds' statutory right to independent counsel before continuing to defend them using panel defense counsel.
- 12. For a year, between May 2009 and May 2010, Philadelphia violated section 2860 by failing to notify the LJCD insureds of their right to independent counsel and by conducting their defense through the services of its panel defense counsel.
- 13. On June 7, 2010, Philadelphia finally acknowledged the insureds' statutory right, but offered to pay LJCD's independent counsel, Sheppard Mullin Richter & Hampton LLP, only reduced rates of \$165 per hour for partners. This was a clear violation of section 2860(c) (which requires insurers to pay an insured's independent counsel the same rates it pays to its panel counsel to defend "similar actions in the community where the claim arose or is being defended") because Philadelphia at the time

set forth herein.

26

27

28

///

///

12

13

11

14

15 16

17

18

19

20

21 22

23 24

25 26

27

28

///

///

- Philadelphia's June 15, 2009 reservation-of-rights letter triggered the LJCD 20. insureds' right to be represented by independent counsel and Philadelphia's duty to inform its insureds of this right.
- Philadelphia breached its statutory duty by failing to inform its insureds of 21. their right to be represented by independent counsel and by failing to obtain a waiver of such right before continuing to defend them through its panel defense counsel.
- Even after the LJCD insureds' discovered, on their own, that they had the 22. right to be represented by independent counsel in the underlying Barbara B. lawsuit, and even after Philadelphia acknowledged that right and agreed to pay the fees and costs of LJCD's independent counsel, Philadelphia breached its statutory duty again by failing to pay any of the fees and costs of LJCD's independent counsel.
- 23. As a result of Philadelphia's intentional breaches of its statutory duty to pay any of the fees and costs of LJCD's independent counsel, it has waived its right to benefit from the rate limitation provision in section 2860. Accordingly, Philadelphia must pay all of the reasonable and necessary fees and costs charged by LJCD's independent counsel, calculated at full rates, in a total amount to be proven at trial.

THIRD CLAIM FOR RELIEF

Tortious Breach Of The Implied Covenant Of Good Faith And Fair Dealing

(By LJCD against Philadelphia)

- Plaintiff incorporates and re-alleges paragraphs 1 through 18 as though fully 24. set forth herein.
- A relationship of trust and confidence was established between Philadelphia, 25. on the one hand, and LJCD on the other hand, by virtue of LJCD's status as an insured under Philadelphia's policy. As a result, Philadelphia had a duty to deal fairly and in good faith in all matters between them.

- 26. LJCD is informed and believes and on that basis alleges that Philadelphia breached its duty of good faith and fair dealing when, among other things, it did the following:
 - a. wrongfully and unreasonably breached its statutory duty to inform its insureds of their right to be represented by independent counsel under 2860;
 - b. wrongfully and unreasonably forced the LJCD defendants to adjudicate the *Barbara B*. lawsuit in a public trial, rather than in private, binding arbitration, in disregard of LJCD's express wishes and best interests, and at a time when the LJCD defendants should have been controlling their own defense through independent counsel;
 - c. intentionally misrepresented coverage available under the Professional Liability Coverage Part in an effort to coerce LJCD to contribute toward a settlement of the underlying *Barbara B*. lawsuit;
 - d. intentionally misrepresented to LJCD the rates it paid to its panel counsel to defend similar actions in San Diego;
 - e. deliberately failed to pay any of LJCD's independent counsel fees and costs;
 - f. ignored and failed to respond to correspondence from LJCD's counsel demanding payment of independent counsel fees and costs.
- 27. As a direct and proximate result of the above-mentioned breaches of the duty of good faith and fair dealing, LJCD has been damaged in an amount to be proven at trial. Said damages exceed the jurisdictional minimum required by this court.
- 28. LJCD is informed and believes and on that basis alleges that Philadelphia has deliberately denied insurance benefits to LJCD, despite knowing facts which established that LJCD was clearly and unambiguously entitled to such benefits. Philadelphia made a calculated and deliberate decision to act in this manner and gamble that its actions would go unchallenged. Philadelphia has intentionally withheld benefits

| 1 2 | Gary W. Osborne (Bar No. 145734) Dominic S. Nesbitt (Bar No. 146590) OSBORNE & NESBITT LLP | | |
|----------|--|-------------------------------|--|
| 3 | 501 West Broadway, Suite 1760 | | |
| 4 | 501 West Broadway, Suite 1760 San Diego, California 92101 Phone: (619) 557-0343 gosborne@onlawllp.com | | |
| 5 | dnesbitt@onlawllp.com Fax: (619) 557-0107 | | |
| 6 | Attorneys for Plaintiff | | |
| 7 | LA JOLLA COUNTRY DAY SCHOOL | | |
| 8 | | | |
| 9 | | | |
| 10 | UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT | | |
| 11 | FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA | | |
| 12 | LA JOLLA COUNTRY DAY | CASE NO. '11 CV0868 LAB WMC | |
| 13 | SCHOOL, a California non-profit corporation, | DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL | |
| 14 | Plaintiff, | DEMIAND FOR JURY TRIAL | |
| 15 | VS. | | |
| 16 17 | PHILADELPHIA INDEMNITY INSURANCE COMPANY, a Pennsylvania corporation, | | |
| 18 | Defendants. | | |
| 19 | | | |
| 20 | | | |
| 21 | Plaintiff La Jolla Country Day School hereby demands a trial by jury. | | |
| 22 | | | |
| 23 | DATED: April 22, 2011 OSB | ORNE & NESBITT LLP | |
| 24 | | | |
| 25 | | Ry: s/Gary W Oshorne | |
| 26 | By: <u>s/Gary W. Osborne</u> Gary W. Osborne Attorney for Plaintiff LA JOLLA | | |
| 27 | COUNTY DAY SCHOOL Email: gosborne@onlawllp.com | | |
| 28 | | 200001114(5)01114111111111111 | |
| - 3 | | | |
| | | | |

Case 3:11-cv-00868-LAB -WMC Document 1 Filed 04/22/11 Page 10 of 10

SJS 44 (Rev. 12/07)

The JS 44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating

| the civil docket sheet. (SEE I | STRUCTIONS ON THE REVERSE OF THE FORM.) | a states i | in september 1777, to require the time and on the country of the purpose of the country of the c | | |
|--|---|--|--|--|--|
| I. (a) PLAINTIFFS | | | DEFENDANTS | | |
| La Jolla Country | y Day School | | | | |
| (c) Attorney's (Firm Name Gary W. Osborn 501 W. Broadwa | of First Listed Plaintiff San Diego XCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES) 2. Address, and Telephone Number) 2. Address, and Telephone Number) 3. Page 1760, San Diego, CA (619) 557-0 DICTION (Place an "X" in One Box Only) 3. Federal Question (U.S. Government Not a Party) 2. 4 Diversity (Indicate Citizenship of Parties in Item III) | Citiz | County of Residence of First Listed Defendant (IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES ONLY) NOTE: IN LAND CONDEMNATION CASES, USE THE LOCATION OF THE LAND INVOLVED. Attorneys (If Known) '11CV0868 LAB WMC CITIZENSHIP OF PRINCIPAL PARTIES(Place an "X" in One Box for Plaintiff (For Diversity Cases Only) and One Box for Defendant) PTF DEF izen of This State '1 | | |
| IV. NATURE OF SUI | T (Place an "X" in One Box Only) | | | | |
| CONTRACT 110 Insurance 120 Marine 130 Miller Act 140 Negotiable Instrument 150 Recovery of Overpayment & Enforcement of Judgment 151 Medicare Act 152 Recovery of Defaulted Student Loans (Excl. Veterans) 153 Recovery of Overpayment of Veteran's Benefits 160 Stockholders' Suits 190 Other Contract 195 Contract Product Liability 196 Franchise REAL PROPERTY 210 Land Condemnation 220 Foreclosure 230 Rent Lease & Ejectment 240 Torts to Land 245 Tort Product Liability 290 All Other Real Property | PERSONAL INJURY 310 Airplane 315 Airplane Product Liability 320 Assault, Libel & Product Liability PERSONAL INJURY 362 Personal Injury Med. Malpractic Med. Malpractic 365 Personal Injury Product Liability | Y 6.6 6.6 6.6 6.6 6.7 7.7 6.7 7.7 6.7 7. | FORFEITURE/PENALTY 610 Agriculture 620 Other Food & Drug 625 Drug Related Seizure of Property 21 USC 881 630 Liquor Laws 640 R.R. & Truck 650 Airline Regs. 660 Occupational Safety/Health 690 Other LABOR 710 Fair Labor Standards Act 720 Labor/Mgmt. Relations 730 Labor/Mgmt.Reporting & Disclosure Act 740 Railway Labor Act 790 Other Labor Litigation 791 Empl. Ret. Inc. Security Act IMMIGRATION 650 Agriculture 622 Appeal 28 USC 158 423 Withdrawal 28 USC 157 430 Banks and Banking 450 Commerce 460 Deportation 470 Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations 480 Consumer Credit 490 Cable/Sat TV 810 Selective Service 850 Securities/Commodities/ Exchange 875 Customer Challenge 12 USC 3410 890 Other Statutory Actions 891 Agricultural Acts 892 Economic Stabilization Act 893 Environmental Matters or Defendant) 894 Energy Allocation Act 190 Other Labor Litigation Act 190 Appeal of Fee Determination Under Equal Access to Justice 1900 Appeal of Fee Determination Under Equal Access to Justice 1950 Constitutionality of State Statutes | | |
| V. ORIGIN (Place an "X" in One Box Only) 1 Original Proceeding 2 Removed from State Court 3 Remanded from Appellate Court 4 Reinstated or Reopened 5 Transferred from another district (specify) 5 Transferred from another district (specify) 7 Appeal to District Judge from Magistrate Judgment | | | | | |
| VI. CAUSE OF ACTION Cite the U.S. Civil Statute under which you are filing (Do not cite jurisdictional statutes unless diversity): 28 U.S.C. Section 1331 Brief description of cause: Breach of insurance contract and bad faith VII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT: COMPLAINT: Cite the U.S. Civil Statute under which you are filing (Do not cite jurisdictional statutes unless diversity): 28 U.S.C. Section 1331 Brief description of cause: Breach of insurance contract and bad faith CHECK YES only if demanded in complaint: exceeding \$75,000 JURY DEMAND: Ves IN No | | | | | |
| VIII. RELATED CASE(S) IF ANY (See instructions): JUDGE DOCKET NUMBER | | | | | |
| DATE | SIGNATURE OF A | TTORNEY | Y OF RECORD | | |
| 04/22/2011 | s/Gary W. Ost | orne, l | Esq. | | |
| FOR OFFICE USE ONLY | | 423 | | | |
| RECEIPT# | AMOUNT APPLYING IFP | | JUDGE MAG. JUDGE | | |